



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,267	08/27/2003	Kenneth E. Flick	58180	6439
27975	7590	04/10/2006	EXAMINER	
ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE P.O. BOX 3791 ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791				SWARTHOUT, BRENT
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2612				

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,267	FLICK, KENNETH E.	
	Examiner Brent A. Swarthout	Art Unit 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-13,15-22,24-37 and 39-41 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 7,14,23,38 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-3-05; 11-21-03

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

a. Claims 1,4,5,6,9,17,20-22,25-27,31-32,35-37 and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (407) in view of Zwern and either Suman et al.(298), Nykerk or Boreham et al.

Hwang discloses a prealarm warning system comprising prealarm sensor (port b, Fig.1) for sensing low level security alert and prealarm emulator 102 for generating a signal on data communication line to alarm controller 103 to cause alert indicator 105 to generate a prealarm different than a full alarm (col.1, line 65-col.2, line 15), except for specifically stating that data communication line between emulator 102 and alarm controller 103 is a bus, or that components of the system are placed in a housing.

Zwern discloses an alarm system add on system wherein an alarm system is placed in housing 12 (Fig. 2).

Furthermore, Suman teaches desirability of using data bus 111 for communicating data for indication of vehicle security (col.7, lines 10-40), whereby the data bus 111 interfaces with plural vehicle systems 101-110 throughout the vehicle, including a security system tamper sensor 105.

Also, Nykerk teaches desirability in a vehicle security system of interfacing security alarm sensing data to data bus 64 throughout vehicle

via processor 60, the data bus 64 also being connected to other vehicle systems (Fig.4).

Boreham further discloses desirability in a vehicle alarm system of using data bus with addressing to provide alarm data to activate a pre-alarm or loud alarm upon a sensed security condition (col.3, lines 25-30; col.4, lines 43-48; col.6, lines 18-27).

It would have been obvious to connect a prealarm warning system as disclosed by Hwang with housing as suggested by Zwern over a vehicle data bus as suggested by either Suman , Nykerk, or Boreham, in order to take advantage of wiring already existing in a vehicle without having to add supplemental wiring to communicate sensed data in a vehicle alarm system, and to allow communication with specific vehicle systems which have individual addresses (col.5, line 17).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a bus as a data communication line, since a bus is a well-known type of communication line in vehicle security communication systems.

Regarding claim 4, Hwang teaches use of sensor b for detecting high security alarm conditions (col.2, lines 5-15).

Regarding claims 5-6, Zwern discloses desirability of indicating confirmation of switching between alarm armed and disarmed modes by LED indications 56,58. Since alarms will only be generated when in

armed mode, some type of communication signal over communication lines would have been inherent in order to control operation of the system.

Regarding claim 9, Hwang teaches use of siren 105.

Regarding claim 39, Zwern teaches desirability of using both shock and motion sensors in a vehicle security system (col. 9, lines 50-52).

Regarding claim 41, Zwern teaches indicator carried on housing (Fig. 2).

2. Claims 2,10,12,13,16,18,28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (407) in view of Zwern and either Suman et al.(298), Nykerk or Boreham et al., and further in view of Hwang (697).

Hwang (697) discloses desirability of making a pre-warn alert shorter than a high level alert (col.2, lines 29-38).

It would have been obvious to use a short pre-warn alert in conjunction with a system as disclosed by Hwang (407), Zwern and either Suman, Nykerk or Boreham in order to notify parties that a vehicle was alarmed while still minimizing nuisance alerts of long duration.

3. Claims 3,8,19,24,29,30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (407) in view of Zwern and either Suman et al.(298), Nykerk or Boreham et al., and further in view of Issa et al.

Issa teaches desirability of using pre-warn alerts of lesser intensity than alarms for high levels of concern (col.3, lines 19-35,65-67).

It would have been obvious to use a lower volume alert for less hazardous conditions as suggested by Issa in conjunction with an alarm system as disclosed by Hwang (407), Zwern, and either Suman, Nykerk or Boreham in order to let a bystander know how serious an alert condition was.

Regarding claim 8, Issa teaches use of a two zone shock sensor, one zone for light touches and a second zone for heavy impacts (col.3, lines 20-25, 65-67).

4. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (407) in view of Zwern, either Suman et al.(298), Nykerk or Boreham et al. and further in view of Hwang (697) and Issa et al.

Claims are rejected for the same reasons as set forth previously with regard to claims 1-3.

5. Regarding applicant's remarks filed 2-8-06, on page 19 it is stated that Suman does not show a bus extending throughout the vehicle. However, Suman teaches the well-known concept of using a vehicle data bus to communicate between plural vehicle systems 101-110 and a controller 77.

On page 19 it is stated that Nykerk does not disclose use of a bus extending throughout the vehicle, but Nykerk does teach that vehicle processor and security alarm system can communicate over data bus 64.

On page 19 it is stated that no motivation is provided for combining Boreham and the other references. However, Boreham discloses desirability of providing addressing data for a vehicle data bus in order that a control unit can communicate with plural

devices other than the siren across a data bus, the bus being throughout the vehicle in order to communicate with plural vehicle systems.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent A Swarthout whose telephone number is 571-272-2979. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Horabik, can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brent Swarthout
Brent A Swarthout
Art Unit 2636

BRENT A. SWARTHOUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER